

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-13, 16 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,407,761 (hereinafter Ching) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,895,472 (hereinafter Brodsky).

Claims 4, 5, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,407,761 (hereinafter Ching) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,895,472 (hereinafter Brodsky) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,230,311 (hereinafter Gerard).

Claims 7 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,407,761 (hereinafter Ching) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,895,472 (hereinafter Brodsky) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,741,982 (hereinafter Soderstrom).

2. Response to Priority

A certified copy of the 103 48 665.8 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b) will be submitted to the USPTO once it is available.

3. Response to Claim Objections

Claims 1, 3, 7, 10, 11, 13, 17 and 20 are objected to because of a number of informalities. The claims are amended to address the objections. The Examiner is thanked for a very thorough review of the claims.

4. Response to 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to clarify that the respective addressed application in the application layer produces information about the data objects and about the registration in a form of a reference to a prescribed structure. In addition, claims 7 and 17 have been amended to clarify that ABAP originally stood for **Allgemeiner Berichtsaufbereitungsprozessor**, which in German means “a generic report preparing processor”. No new matter is introduced by these clarifying amendments, which are made solely to better illustrate the points discussed below.

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-13, 16 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ching in view of Brodsky.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art references, when combined, must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on the applicant’s disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

In the present case, both Ching and Brodsky fail to teach or suggest at least one feature in the claims. In particular, the combination of these references fail to teach the presently claimed feature of “the respective addressed application in the application layer, in response to a registration operation, producing information about the data objects and about the registration in a form of *a reference to a prescribed structure*” (Claim 1; emphasis added).

Ching provides a system and method for the visual customization of business object interfaces. Ching further discloses a Business Object Repository (BOR) for storing the business objects and associated information. In particular, Ching teaches that the “registration of objects is performed via the definition of object types in the BOR. At runtime, objects are also accessed by the clients through the BOR, which passes on the request on the object and reports result back to the client” (Ching, Col.5, lines 43-46). It is noted that nowhere in Ching is there any mention of

producing information of the data objects and the registration in a form of a **reference to a prescribed structure** as presently claimed. This alone is sufficient for the present application to be patentable over Ching.

Brodsky also fails to rectify the deficiencies of Ching. Brodsky discloses an application programming interface (API) that provides the necessary functions for a computer system to make changes to an object-oriented system. However, none of the API functions includes “producing information about the data objects and about the registration in a form of a reference to a prescribed structure” (Claim 1). Therefore, it is apparent that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Ching and Brodsky.

In view of the remarks above, it is also submitted that Ching in view of Brodsky fails to render claim 11 obvious. Accordingly, claims 1, 11 and their dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons stated above.

5. Conclusion

Having tendered the above remarks and amended the claims as indicated herein, the Applicants respectfully submit that all rejections have been addressed and that the claims are now in a condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666. If a telephone interview would in any way expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Jaina Chua at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP



Chze Koon Chua
Reg. No. 53,831

Dated: October 28, 2005

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300